

CORRESPONDENCE

Race Crossing

To the Editor, *Eugenics Review*

SIR,—None of the participants in the correspondence concerning human races in your columns seem to be aware that the questions raised can be largely solved by methods due to Darlington. If the European and negro races are so different as to merit the title of species they will probably have a different chromosomal structure. This will cause characteristic anomalies in the meiosis of hybrids which are not found in the pure races.

If on the other hand no such anomalies are found, the differences are presumably due to genes, such as are responsible for the variation within a species. All that is needed to clear up the problem is a supply of properly fixed testes, and the services of one of the few cytologists who possess the requisite technical ability.

It is however most unlikely that the research will be undertaken, if only because most people have made up their minds on the race problem, and would not welcome a search for evidence which might prove them wrong.

J. B. S. HALDANE.

University College,
Gower Street, W.C.1.

To the Editor, *Eugenics Review*

SIR,—In my letter in your last issue, instead of "the whole of the Bovidae" I should have written "the group of the Bovidae including cattle, zebu, bison, yaks, etc." The species in this group are interfertile, with only slight indications of sterility in certain crosses. Mr. Julian Huxley has avoided my point that infertility as a criterion of species is out of date and is no longer applicable to animals, to plants or to man himself.

All the modern paleontological evidence regarding man goes to show that the mongoloid, caucasoid, negroid and australoid types of man have evolved separately over long periods in geographical isolation from each other. In any other group of organisms the differences they show would be regarded as specific. The idea of *Homo sapiens* grew up in the days of the "lumpers" of species, and has survived because it placated man's vanity to suppose that there is only one living human species. This idea is not supported by examination from a critical point of view.

Mr. Huxley protests against the description of *We Europeans* as a propagandist work. Since it seeks to deny that even human races exist, it flies in the face of facts patent to everyone and fundamental to anthropologists. It therefore ranks itself as a propagandist rather than a scientific work.

R. RUGGLES GATES.

King's College, London.

Nordics and Jews

To the Editor, *Eugenics Review*

SIR,—Surely Mr. Thompson in his letter which you publish in the July number of the *Review* has beaten *Little Arthur* for simplification of history. Quite a number of events happened between the time of Edward I and Elizabeth that may have contributed to England's blossoming under that great queen. By parity of reasoning, the apogee of England's political greatness, the Victorian Age, was a result of the admission of Jews under Cromwell. It would be surprising if such actions as the freeing of the West Indian slaves, at a cost to this country of twenty million pounds, was the result of a small leavening of any people. Will not Mr. Thompson give facts *proving* the pernicious influence of the Jews in this country? No marks will be given for general statements and personal opinions. Clear statements of cause and effect are required, such as may be hoped for in scientific journals.

C. G. SELIGMAN.

Court Leys, Toot Baldon,
Oxford.

Policy of the Society

To the Editor, *Eugenics Review*

SIR,—Our *Society* changed its name a short time ago from *The Eugenics Education Society* to *The Eugenics Society*, presumably to indicate that its efforts were henceforth to be limited no longer to educating the public in eugenics, but were to include others of a more practical nature. Yet even to-day one might almost say that the only forms of practical eugenics ever discussed, even among eugenists themselves, in England at least, are voluntary sterilization of aments, and voluntary pre-marital schedules, on the one hand, and the encouragement, on the other, of increased effective fertility among the more efficient sections of society. Birth-control cannot be called practical eugenics, since it is generally made to serve purely selfish ends.

Now, Sir, it is universally admitted that, as long as we limit our endeavours to this sort of propaganda work, results will be very slow to show themselves. Can we afford to go so slowly? If other nations work faster and succeed in bringing about rapid improvement in their human stock—nations, moreover, who are troubled with no scruples about ways and means for securing to themselves the territory they need and the survival which they believe to be the birth-right of the fittest—shall we continue to live as a nation at all until the results of our slow and cautious methods have had time to become perceptible?

For years I have been urging to the best of my powers, by means of books, articles and pamphlets, that we should begin to apply what practical methods eugenics may offer for bettering our race, without so great hesitation and caution—results, no doubt, of an exaggerated fear of public opinion—and that we should really *get somewhere*. But British eugenicists are very timid, as witness the extreme timidity of the wording of our voluntary sterilization bills, which, as it seems to me, has been one reason for their failure—for who can become enthusiastic about measures whose practical results will be almost nil!

The *Eugenics Society* is one of the wealthiest in England. Is it right or politic that its capital should be largely idle, and the interest thereon be largely devoted to helping other kindred societies while we do so little work of our own other than educational? Or should we not better serve our cause if we applied it to well-considered practical schemes of a sort calculated to bring about improvement in our British human stock, since other nations have begun already to improve theirs with a declared view to ultimate world hegemony, which must be largely at our expense? The initiation of one such scheme might, moreover, attract more public attention and so bring about more eugenic education than a thousand lectures.

Your reviewer, in speaking of my latest book, *Paradise Found*, owns that "there can be little doubt that if they [the ideas of the "Eugenians"] were universally adopted, human beings would be a good deal happier than they are." Those ideas, and their institutions, include much at which current morality would certainly jib, as, for instance, the "Seminal Gardens," and these no doubt are among the methods which your reviewer says "the *Eugenics Society* would certainly not endorse." And yet *what higher aim can "morality" set before us than human happiness?*

But there are many other ways that would not run counter to current ethics, in which beginnings might be made, at any time, in the field of practical eugenics, and I hope before long to be able to return to England after my long exile (due to politicians and their false ultra-nationalistic economics), and devote myself to one of these, namely the founding of at least one "Eugenic Orphanage," where orphans and others of really sound stock could be reared for the nation, and later on, settled on the land in one carefully chosen neighbourhood so as eventually to people those parts with the best our race can produce.

This is a work that might be begun on any scale, from the humblest to the most ambitious, and could increase its usefulness as opportunity might offer; until eventually it might, through the growth of numerous eugenic colonies, sprung from these humble beginnings, bring about physical and mental regeneration of the whole nation. And this, though it might take generations to become

completely effective, would at least be much more rapid in its working than any of our present methods.

May this letter from a Life Fellow, and one of the oldest members of the *Society*, prepare the way for a sympathetic attitude at least from fellow eugenicists!

C. WICKSTEED ARMSTRONG.

Petropolis, Brazil.

Intelligence Tests

To the Editor, Eugenics Review

SIR,—Mrs. Hodson's letter in your April number embodies such an astonishing misconception of the nature of the Intelligence Quotient that it seems necessary for someone to correct her. The average I.Q. of the population is *by definition* equal to *exactly* 100 in *every* country where an intelligence test has been properly standardized. Moreover, in every country where similar tests are applied, the same proportion of the population possesses I.Q.s below 95 (namely about 37 per cent.), and below 75 (namely about 5 per cent.). It is of course conceivable that standardized tests in Germany are more difficult than similar tests in Great Britain; if that were so then I.Q. 100 in Germany would represent a higher level of intelligence than the same figure in this country. But I know of no data which supports this supposition; and an examination of Bobertag's, Binet's, Terman's, Burt's and other versions of the Binet-Simon test suggest that they are very close to one another in level of difficulty.

The only investigation which comes to mind where British, Germans, and other nationalities have been compared by an *identical* test is that of the American Army psychologists, who tested huge groups of immigrants during the war. These may not, of course, have been typical of the countries from which they came. Nevertheless, it is interesting to see that the British immigrants showed the highest intelligence, Dutch next, German next, Scandinavian next, and that members of other European countries fell a long way behind.

P. E. VERNON.

National Committee for the Training of Teachers,
Jordanhill, Glasgow, W.3.

Abortion and Eugenics

To the Editor, Eugenics Review

SIR,—As you refer (p. 124) to a movement for reform of the abortion law, I hope you will allow me to state my opinion that dysgenic selection will continue until artificial termination of pregnancy is made available to all women in the financially poorest classes who have two or more children. This opinion is supported, in effect, by views expressed by several eminent members of the